

1 APPEARANCES:

2 John Clemons
3 Southern Illinois Law Center, LLC
4 813 West Main Street
5 Carbondale, Illinois 62901
6 (Appearing on behalf of Petitioners via
7 phone.)

8 Mark Ortlieb
9 Illinois Bell Telephone Company
10 225 West Randolph Street, Rm 25D
11 Chicago, Illinois 60606
12 (Appearing on behalf of AT&T via phone.)

13 Richard Hird
14 Petefish Immel Heeb & Hird, LLP
15 842 Louisiana Street
16 Lawrence, Kansas 66044
17 (Appearing on behalf of NG-911, Inc. by
18 phone.)

19 John Kelly
20 Ottosen Britz Kelly Cooper Gilbert & DiNolfo, LTD
21 1804 North Naper Blvd., Suite 350
22 Naperville, Illinois 60563
23 (Appearing on behalf of NG-911, Inc. by
24 phone.)

Matthew Harvey
Office of General Counsel
Illinois Commerce Commission
160 N. LaSalle St., Suite C-800
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(Appearing on behalf of Staff of the
Illinois Commerce Commission via phone.)

Michael Ramsey
NG-911, Inc.
President & CEO
815 South Highland
Williamsburg, Iowa 52361
(Appearing on behalf of NG-911, Inc. by
phone.)

1 I N D E X

2	WITNESSES	PAGE
3	MICHAEL RAMSEY	
	Examination by Mr. Hird	32, 52
4	Examination by Mr. Ortlieb	33
5	TRACY FELTY	
	Examination by Mr. Clemons	56
6	Examination by Mr. Ortlieb	59
7	STEVE GALT	
	Examination by Mr. Clemons	65
8	Examination by Mr. Ortlieb	68
9	STACY ROSS	
	Examination by Mr. Harvey	71
10	Examination by Mr. Ortlieb	73
	Examination by Judge Albers	76

11

12

13

14 EXHIBITS

15

16	NG-911, Inc. Exhibit 1.0, 1.1, 2.0	55
17	Saline Exhibits 1.0 & 2.0, Attachments A & B	64
18	Gallatin Exhibit 1.0 & 2.0, Attachment A to 2.0	70
19		
20	Staff Exhibit 1.0	76
21	Staff Exhibits 2.0 & 3.0	78

22

23

24

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 JUDGE ALBERS: By the authority vested in me
3 by the Illinois Commerce Commission, I now call
4 Docket Numbers 14-0406 and 14-0407. These petitions
5 concern the modification of the 9-1-1 system for
6 Gallatin County and Saline County, respectfully.

7 May I have the appearances for the record,
8 please?

9 MR. CLEMONS: Yes, your Honor. For the
10 Petitioners in both of the proceedings involving both
11 Gallatin County and Saline County, John R. Clemons,
12 attorney for both counties, of the Southern Illinois
13 Law Center, 813 West Main Street, Carbondale,
14 Illinois, 62901.

15 MR. RAMSEY: Representing NG-911, Inc.,
16 Michael L. Ramsey, President and CEO, located at 815
17 South Highland Street, Williamsburg, Iowa, 52361.
18 Telephone (319) 668-8911.

19 MR. HIRD: Your Honor, this is Richard W.
20 Hird of the Petefish, Immel, Heeb and Hird Law Firm,
21 842 Louisiana Street, Lawrence, Kansas. Telephone is
22 (785) 843-0450. And I am counsel for NG-911, Inc.

23 MR. KELLY: And this is John Kelly,
24 K-E-L-L-Y, of the Ottosen, O-T-T-O-S-E-N, Britz,

1 B-R-I-T-Z, Firm, 1804 North Naper Boulevard,
2 Naperville, Illinois, 60563. Additional counsel for
3 NG-911, Inc.

4 MR. HARVEY: Appearing for the Staff of the
5 Illinois Commerce Commission, Matthew L. Harvey, 160
6 North LaSalle Street, Suite C-800, Chicago, Illinois,
7 60601.

8 JUDGE ALBERS: Mr. Ortlieb.

9 MR. ORTLIEB: This is Mark Ortlieb,
10 O-R-T-L-I-E-B. I am counsel for AT&T Illinois and
11 AT&T Mobility. I am at 225 West Randolph Street,
12 Suite 2500, Chicago, 60606.

13 JUDGE ALBERS: Thank you.

14 Are there any others wishing to enter an
15 appearance?

16 (No response.)

17 JUDGE ALBERS: Let the record show no
18 response.

19 The purpose of today's hearing is to admit
20 into evidence, subject to cross, the previously
21 submitted testimony in this matter. Before turning
22 to our first witness, however, does anyone have any
23 preliminary matters they'd like to raise?

24 MR. CLEMONS: Nothing from the Petitioners.

1 MR. HIRD: Your Honor, this is Richard Hird
2 on behalf of NG-911, Inc. If it becomes -- it
3 depends on how long Mr. Ortlieb's cross examination
4 is of the Applicant's witnesses. But due to the
5 delay of starting this proceeding, I have limited
6 time with Mr. Ramsey here today. So I am hoping to
7 get him on and off.

8 JUDGE ALBERS: Okay. Is it his schedule or
9 your schedule that --

10 MR. HIRD: It's his schedule that's the
11 problem.

12 JUDGE ALBERS: Okay. That's fine. Thank
13 you.

14 If there's nothing else then, we'll go ahead
15 and go straight to our first --

16 MR. ORTLIEB: Your Honor, just one thing.
17 This is Mark Ortlieb.

18 I did distribute to the parties my estimates
19 for cross. And they were for witnesses, you know,
20 15 minutes or less. Except for Mr. Ramsey, I had a
21 little bit more for him. Perhaps 30 minutes to
22 45 minutes.

23 JUDGE ALBERS: All right. We'll try to get
24 through that. We'll have him go on the stand first

1 then, so to speak.

2 We'll go ahead then. And Mr. Hird, would
3 you like to call your witness? I will swear him in.
4 And I guess I'll go ahead and swear any other
5 witnesses who are going to be testifying as well
6 today.

7 MR. HIRD: Thank you, your Honor. I would
8 call Michael Ramsey.

9 JUDGE ALBERS: I think we also have
10 questions for Ms. Ross, Mr. Galt and Mr. Felty, as
11 well, I assume.

12 MR. CLEMONS: Yes, your Honor.

13 JUDGE ALBERS: Are they available?

14 MR. CLEMONS: Yes, your Honor. This is John
15 Clemons. I plan on calling Tracy Felty and Steve
16 Galt.

17 JUDGE ALBERS: Are they listening to us now?

18 MR. CLEMONS: They are here in my conference
19 room on the speakerphone.

20 JUDGE ALBERS: Great. I just wanted to
21 swear them in.

22 If you could each please stand and raise
23 your right hand.

24 (Witnesses sworn by Judge.)

1 JUDGE ALBERS: Thank you.

2 Mr. Hird, if you would like to introduce Mr.

3 Ramsey.

4 MR. HIRD: Thank you, your Honor.

5 * * * * *

6 MICHAEL RAMSEY,

7 of lawful age, produced, sworn and examined on behalf

8 of NG-911, INC., testifies and says:

9 DIRECT EXAMINATION

10 QUESTIONS BY MR. HIRD:

11 Q. Mr. Ramsey, would you please state your name

12 for the record?

13 A. Michael L. Ramsey.

14 Q. What is your business address?

15 A. 815 South Highland Street, Williamsburg,

16 Iowa, 52361.

17 Q. Mr. Ramsey, are you the same person that

18 caused Exhibit 1.0, the pre-filed direct testimony of

19 Michael J. Ramsey; and Exhibit 1.1, resume of Michael

20 J. Ramsey; and NG-911, Inc. Exhibit 2.0 pre-filed

21 rebuttal testimony of Michael J. Ramsey to be filed

22 on the e-Docket system?

23 A. I am, sir.

24 Q. And you are, today, appearing for the

1 purpose of entering that testimony into evidence.

2 Do you understand that?

3 A. Yes, I am entering such into evidence.

4 Q. Mr. Ramsey, if I ask you the same questions
5 today that are set forth in your pre-filed direct and
6 rebuttal testimony, would your answers be the same?

7 A. They would be the same, indeed.

8 MR. HIRD: Your Honor, I would move for the
9 admission of NG-911, Inc. Exhibits 1.0, 1.1 and 2.0,
10 and would tender Mr. Ramsey for cross examination.

11 JUDGE ALBERS: All right. We'll rule on the
12 admissibility following the cross examination.

13 I believe the only party that has questions
14 is AT&T. So Mr. Ortlieb.

15 MR. ORTLIEB: Thank you, your Honor.

16 CROSS EXAMINATION

17 QUESTIONS BY MR. ORTLIEB:

18 Q. Good morning, Mr. Ramsey. My name is Mark
19 Ortlieb and I am an attorney for AT&T Illinois and
20 AT&T Mobility.

21 Can you hear me okay?

22 A. Yes, sir. Go ahead. I hear you fine, Mr.
23 Ortlieb.

24 Q. Great. Thank you.

1 Did you help prepare the plan narratives for
2 both Gallatin and Saline Counties?

3 A. I did so, yes, sir.

4 Q. And do they differ at all from the plan
5 narrative that was submitted on behalf of Jackson
6 County in a prior proceeding?

7 A. To the extent of individuality and
8 implementation, filing implementation test plans,
9 they do vary.

10 Q. Do they vary in any other way?

11 A. No, sir, they don't.

12 Q. Has the proposed network changed at all from
13 the one described in the Jackson County petition?

14 A. No. The prescribed implementation of the
15 network is consistent to deliver, as needed, to
16 Gallatin and Saline Counties as prescribed in the
17 testimony.

18 Q. Has there been any change since the Jackson
19 County petition was filed to the vendors that are
20 involved?

21 A. No, sir, there's no changes in the vendors.

22 Q. I would like to direct your attention in
23 your direct testimony.

24 Do you have that in front of you?

1 A. I do, sir.

2 Q. I direct your attention to line 68.

3 A. I have it in front of me, yes.

4 Q. There, you discuss NG-911's initial role as
5 a vendor and as a project manager, is that correct?

6 A. Yes, sir.

7 Q. And I understand that, later on, that role
8 has evolved. But could you -- with that as a
9 backdrop, can you identify for me the companies or
10 the vendors that are involved in the project to
11 deploy Next Generation 911 to Gallatin and Saline
12 Counties?

13 A. Yes, sir. It's NG-911, Inc. It is On
14 Point, LLC is project manager, project management.
15 It is Assure 911 as our network engineering firm. It
16 is HigherGround as our MIS and IP reporting package
17 vendor. It is Oracle as our SBC firewall vendor. It
18 is Solacom as our CPE IPSR CPE handing out a
19 controller. And it is Datamaster as our 911 database
20 management for IP LVF/LCRF.

21 Q. Thank you for that list.

22 What about Clearwave? They appear on some
23 of the network diagrams, don't they?

24 A. Yes. In completion on the original

1 question, Clearwave is acting as our network
2 facilitation, our network provider. And BullBerry,
3 now Zuercher, is our allied map data GIS provider.

4 Q. Thank you. So Clearwave, BullBerry. And
5 what about INdigital, are they involved?

6 A. INdigital and Frontier are our aggregation
7 network provider for 911 landline and wireless.

8 Q. Frontier is providing a service called FAS,
9 correct?

10 A. That's correct.

11 Q. Frontier Aggregation Service, correct?

12 A. Yes, sir.

13 Q. What about INdigital, what are they doing?

14 A. INdigital is the provider of choice to
15 deliver from Frontier's analog -- (chirping noise).

16 INdigital is the network IP provider for the
17 FAS element from Frontier.

18 Q. From Frontier to what location?

19 A. To the IP FAS connection located in
20 Carbondale.

21 Q. Thank you.

22 And does INdigital do anything else?

23 A. No, sir, they do not.

24 Q. Is an outfit called Aero, A-E-R-O, are they

1 involved?

2 A. Aero -- correct me if I am wrong, Bart -- I
3 am not familiar with Aero, unless it's a network
4 provider that was contacted to deliver IP
5 connectivity. But to this point, I don't believe
6 there is an agreement.

7 Q. Thank you. I want to switch now and ask
8 some questions related to direct connection.

9 And do you agree, Mr. Ramsey, that AT&T does
10 have the option to --

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. -- complete 911 calls by a direct
13 connection?

14 A. Yes, you do have the appropriate option to
15 do that within the Gallatin and Saline County, as
16 well as the CSI.

17 MR. HIRD: Your Honor, this is Richard Hird.
18 I want to interject an objection to the extent that
19 that question calls for a legal conclusion.

20 MR. ORTLIEB: Well, your Honor, I would
21 simply respond it's been at issue in the case. It is
22 plainly addressed in the plan narratives submitted by
23 both counties. And both counties say that direct
24 connection is an option. I don't think that's a

1 legal conclusion. They say it is part of their plan.

2 MR. HIRD: I apologize. The reason for my
3 objection was the way that the question was
4 formulated.

5 The question was: You agree, Mr. Ramsey,
6 that AT&T has the option to direct connect.

7 That infers that, as a legal matter, it's
8 entirely AT&T's option, which it clearly isn't.

9 MR. ORTLIEB: Well, if it would help assist,
10 your Honor, I can qualify the question so that I am
11 not asking for a legal conclusion.

12 JUDGE ALBERS: Yeah, why don't you do that.

13 Q. (By Mr. Ortlieb) Mr. Ramsey, without
14 respect to what any statute or Order might require,
15 you agree, do you not, that the plan narratives filed
16 in this case state that AT&T has the option to direct
17 connect to the data centers?

18 A. Yes. Without any conflict to status, there
19 is the option available to AT&T and any and all
20 others carriers.

21 Q. And is it NG-911's position that it agrees?
22 And would that aspect of the plan narrative that AT&T
23 does have that option to do direct connections?

24 A. It does have that option outstanding what

1 the final plans today using the FAS interconnection
2 agreement.

3 Q. I am not talking about -- just for
4 definition-sake, FAS is something other than direct
5 connection. When I use the term direct connection, I
6 am speaking not of FAS, but I am speaking of a
7 connection that would be established for the delivery
8 -- exclusive delivery of AT&T traffic to the NG-911
9 data centers.

10 Can we have that understanding for my
11 questions?

12 A. Yes, that understanding is accepted.

13 Q. Thank you.

14 So the question then is whether NG-911's
15 position in this case is that AT&T does have the
16 option -- and I am not talking as a legal matter, but
17 just has the option to establish direct connections
18 with the NG-911 data centers?

19 A. That is correct, you do have the option.

20 Q. Thank you. And --

21 JUDGE ALBERS: Take a little break here.

22 Off the record.

23 (Discussion off the record.)

24 JUDGE ALBERS: Back on the record.

1 Q. (By Mr. Ortlieb) So Mr. Ramsey, I refer you
2 now to further along in your direct testimony at
3 lines 119 and line 120.

4 A. I have that in front of me. Go ahead.

5 Q. It says Clearwave has elected to directly
6 connect to the two data centers. Is that correct?

7 A. That is correct.

8 Q. So now, the two data centers in question
9 here, first of all, those are your data centers in
10 Harrisburg and Murphysboro, correct?

11 A. That is correct.

12 Q. And what did Clearwave have to do to
13 establish those direct connections?

14 A. Well, it's part of their network delivery
15 scheme. So as the provider of the network, they
16 already have direct connect enablement, because of
17 the ESInet deliverable to both data centers.

18 Q. Does that mean that they have transport that
19 runs into each of those data centers?

20 A. That is correct.

21 Q. And that that transport is terminated at
22 some location within the data centers?

23 A. That is correct.

24 Q. And what type of equipment does that

1 transport terminate on?

2 A. It's fiber inbound and it transports through
3 network devices into the SBCs, Session Border
4 Controllers, for a secure network delivery of the
5 ESInet.

6 Q. And do you know at what capacity or what
7 speeds the fiber is configured to transmit?

8 A. There's at least 100 meg of transport
9 between the two data centers. And for each ESInet
10 drop to each one of the dedicated PSAPs, there are
11 one 5 megabit pipe from each data center to each PSAP
12 making it redundant delivery from the data centers.

13 Q. And in the point in the data centers at
14 which this fiber is terminated, you call that an SBC,
15 correct?

16 A. Yes. An SBC is a Session Border Controller.

17 Q. And that accepts an IP signal, correct?

18 A. Yes, it does, sir.

19 Q. And is there just a single SBC in each of
20 the two data centers?

21 A. No. There's dual redundant SBCs for a total
22 of four. Two each at each data center.

23 Q. The Clearwave fiber facility in each data
24 center really terminates at two different places

1 within the data center?

2 A. Yes, sir.

3 Q. Now, have any other carriers established

4 direct connection similar to Clearwave?

5 A. No, they have not.

6 Q. Has any carrier, other than Illinois,

7 expressed an interest in doing so?

8 A. There has been outstanding requests from

9 AT&T Mobility for direct connects, which they have

10 informed Mr. Felty that they are not ready to deliver

11 direct connect yet.

12 Q. Anyone other than AT&T Mobility?

13 A. No, sir, not at this time.

14 Q. Now, from a nuts and bolts perspective, what

15 would a carrier like AT&T Mobility need to do to

16 establish a direct connection with your data centers?

17 A. In the respect network would be a local

18 exchange or a local taut to deliver into both -- each

19 of the data centers through the Session Border

20 Controllers and IP deliverable mechanism fiber.

21 Q. In that respect, would it look a lot like

22 the Clearwave connection we just talked about?

23 A. It very well could be, yes.

24 Q. Would it have to be at the same capacity as

1 the Clearwave fiber facilities?

2 A. To keep a robust link and provide
3 redundancy, we would sit down and verify that the
4 bandwidth deliverable from AT&T would meet or exceed
5 the recommended build-outs that have been established
6 today.

7 Q. So that AT&T Mobility might have the same
8 bandwidth capacity as Clearwave, but it could be
9 something different?

10 A. Yes. It's also based on traffic, that is
11 correct.

12 Q. Is there any collocation requirement for
13 space inside the data center?

14 A. No, there is not.

15 Q. Would AT&T have to pay any charges to NG-911
16 to establish the type of links you've just described?

17 A. No, they would not.

18 Q. Referring further on in your testimony to
19 lines 232 down to 237.

20 A. I am there, go ahead.

21 Q. And that says that NG-911 will coordinate
22 the installation of all network components with
23 participating OSPs and/or third party providers who
24 may connect its network and transport 911 traffic to

1 the system.

2 What does that mean?

3 A. It simply means that with the communications
4 with the perspective PSAP, we would do what we have
5 been doing in the past to facilitate proper
6 engineering, considerations on traffic, and
7 deliverable hardware mechanisms to deliver those
8 network components into our local ESInet to provide
9 the service by the carriers.

10 Q. And that would apply to AT&T Mobility in our
11 example, would it not?

12 A. Yes, it would, sir.

13 Q. In other words, if AT&T Mobility did
14 establish a direct connection, then NG-911 would
15 coordinate the installation of those network
16 components?

17 A. Yes. Through the auspicious control of the
18 PSAP, yes.

19 Q. Thank you.

20 Now, getting back to the Jackson County case
21 for just a moment.

22 Did you receive a copy of the Commission's
23 Order in that case?

24 A. I did so, yes.

1 Q. You don't happen to have a copy with you, do
2 you?

3 A. No, sir, I do not have that with me.

4 Q. Do you recall on -- there was an issue in
5 the case dealing with direct connections. Is that --

6 A. I am sorry. I don't have it in front of me,
7 so I can't comment on that.

8 Q. Do you recall that the Order says that the
9 Commission expects any direct connection requests by
10 an access carrier to be given fair and timely
11 consideration?

12 A. Without saying -- without making improper
13 comments, I would have to, once again, note that it
14 is non-visibile judgment call on that. I know that
15 there has been conversation. But in direct -- in
16 answer to your direct question, I cannot answer that.
17 I do not have the document in front of me.

18 Q. Let me try it this way.

19 If you were to receive a request from a
20 carrier, AT&T Mobility could be another carrier.
21 What would you consider to be timely consideration on
22 behalf of NG-911 for that request?

23 A. Pending agent hearing, pending acceptance,
24 network engineering plans with the local petitioner,

1 I would have to say anywhere from four to eight weeks
2 possibility without knowing exactly what the intent
3 is or the network application is from each individual
4 carrier.

5 It can be, and very possibly, a
6 time-consuming situation. It depends if all parties
7 have the right information and deliverables.

8 Q. Did I hear you correctly to say four to
9 eight weeks?

10 A. It's very possible, yes. It could be
11 sooner; could be longer.

12 Q. So in other words, 30 to 60 days?

13 A. Yes. That's a good estimated professional
14 judgment.

15 Q. Thank you.

16 Now, switching topics again. This has to do
17 with a process question.

18 There are a total of 16 entities that have
19 to file 911 modifications at the Commission, correct?

20 A. That is correct. Sixteen agencies, 21
21 PSAPs.

22 Q. And so far, if my count is correct, there
23 have been seven filings?

24 A. I believe so.

1 Mr. Hird, could you answer that properly?

2 Q. I don't want to ask questions of your

3 lawyer. Let's just go through them.

4 We know Jackson County was filed, correct?

5 A. Correct.

6 Q. And Gallatin and Saline are pending here

7 today?

8 A. That's correct.

9 Q. Perry County is filed?

10 A. What county?

11 Q. Perry.

12 A. Perry is, correct.

13 Q. Williamson County?

14 A. That's correct.

15 Q. Union County?

16 A. Correct.

17 Q. And the City of Marion?

18 A. That's correct. It's a total of seven.

19 Q. Are there any others that I did not include

20 on this list?

21 A. At this time, no. I think we're still

22 completing other filings.

23 Q. Do you know what the schedule is for the

24 remaining filings?

1 A. I do not.

2 Q. Are they filings that NG-911 hopes to have
3 completed within the next 60 days?

4 MR. HIRD: Your Honor, I am going to object
5 to this line of questioning. Mr. Ramsey is not the
6 one that is preparing the filings. Those are being
7 done by the ETSBs. He's not the person qualified to
8 answer these questions. But it's well beyond the
9 scope of his direct testimony or rebuttal testimony.

10 MR. CLEMONS: And Judge, the Petitioner
11 would join in that. This is not an appropriate
12 witness with that knowledge.

13 MR. ORTLIEB: Well, all counties have
14 testified that Mr. Ramsey has participated in the
15 development of plan narratives that go with the
16 petitions.

17 And your Honor, I am not trying to get at
18 any privileged information here. I just -- you know,
19 everybody at the hearing today is involved in these
20 proceedings. We know there are more coming. I am
21 just asking a question what we can all expect as an
22 industry in the coming few months.

23 MR. HIRD: Your Honor, this is Rick Hird
24 again. That can be done offline, off the record.

1 JUDGE ALBERS: The objection is sustained.

2 Q. (By Mr. Ortlieb) Mr. Ramsey, back to

3 Jackson County. Now, that plan modification Order

4 was approved on June 26th, correct?

5 A. Yes, it was.

6 Q. And do you know what the implementation

7 interval is for Jackson County?

8 A. We are looking at completing testing and

9 cutting over on September 21st or 22nd, pending any

10 and all pretest plans and whatever mechanisms.

11 Q. That would be a, roughly, 90-day period from

12 Order approval to cutover?

13 A. Yes. I believe the final date is

14 September 24th. Would make it just a little over

15 90 days.

16 Q. Do you expect a similar interval for both

17 Gallatin and Saline Counties?

18 A. It is possible. It may go quicker.

19 Q. And then, sir, my last line of questions

20 have to do with lines --

21 JUDGE ALBERS: Mr. Ramsey, are you on a

22 speakerphone.

23 MR. RAMSEY: No, sir. I am on a wireless

24 headset.

1 JUDGE ALBERS: Okay. Your voice just sounds
2 a little course or gravelly.

3 MR. RAMSEY: Okay. Let me move from my
4 headset. Stand by.

5 Is that better?

6 MR. ORTLIEB: That's much better.

7 JUDGE ALBERS: Thank you.

8 MR. ORTLIEB: Too bad we're doing this at
9 the end of your examination.

10 Q. (By Mr. Ortlieb) But over at the bottom of
11 page 16, top of page 17, are you there?

12 A. Beginning at line 318?

13 Q. Right.

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And there, sir, you talk about additional
16 conditions that NG-911 has agreed to as a result of
17 the Jackson County docket, correct?

18 A. Yes. Those were requested by Staff and was
19 approved by our company as well.

20 Q. Item B that you refer to on line 323 is
21 participation in weekly implementation conference
22 calls?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. With all parties?

1 A. Correct.

2 Q. Now, does that include carriers -- access
3 carriers whose calls will be affected by the cutover?

4 A. At this time, we are witness to what has
5 been explained in Item B, but there is no problem to
6 add any and all carriers in the event that that
7 request is made by the carriers. We have no issues
8 with that.

9 Q. If AT&T Mobility, for example, wanted to
10 participate in weekly implementation conference
11 calls, it could do that?

12 A. If they -- yes, yes.

13 Q. Thank you.

14 A. My answer is yes.

15 Q. And as to the remainder of the items
16 discussed A, C, D and E, any reports that are issued
17 pursuant to those items, are those available to be
18 looked at by industry?

19 A. I would have to refer that question to Judge
20 Albers. If there's any restrictions or its open.
21 Non-proprietary.

22 Q. As a matter of practice, do you know how
23 they're being shared today?

24 A. They're being shared by our project manager,

1 program manager Bart Lovett.

2 Q. With Staff only or with other parties?

3 A. With those parties that are participating on
4 a weekly basis, correct.

5 Q. So if one participates in the conference
6 calls, then theoretically, there may be access to
7 additional reports?

8 A. That is correct.

9 MR. ORTLIEB: Mr. Ramsey, I have no further
10 questions. Thank you very much for your time this
11 morning.

12 JUDGE ALBERS: Mr. Hird, do you have any
13 redirect?

14 MR. HIRD: Yes, I do your Honor. It won't
15 take me but just a minute.

16 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

17 QUESTIONS BY MR. HIRD:

18 Q. Mr. Ramsey, Mr. Ortlieb asked you a lot of
19 questions about direct connections. And he referred
20 repeatedly to whether it was AT&T's option to direct
21 connect.

22 Do you recall those questions?

23 A. I do, sir.

24 Q. Is it really AT&T's option entirely to

1 direct connect?

2 A. No, it is not. The option for direct
3 connection is part of the engineering and
4 implementation build-out plan with the ETSB and the
5 particular petitioner under the Administrative Law
6 Statutes that we all subscribe to.

7 Q. There was a question that he asked about
8 whether AT&T Mobility had requested direct connection
9 or you may have inferred that in your answer.

10 AT&T Mobility has never requested direct
11 connection, have they?

12 A. They have never requested it. We made
13 contact with AT&T Mobility.

14 Q. I want to make sure that the record is clear
15 that NG-911, Inc. made the contact with AT&T
16 Mobility, is that correct?

17 A. That's correct.

18 Q. And the response that Mr. Felty got was that
19 AT&T Mobility is not ready for direct connection, is
20 that correct?

21 A. That is correct.

22 Q. And that was provided in a data request
23 response to AT&T in this matter, wasn't it?

24 A. Yes, it was, sir.

1 Q. That was in about February of this year,
2 correct?

3 A. Yes, it was early in the year.

4 Q. One other line of questions.

5 Mr. Ortlieb was asking you about the time
6 for consideration of a request for direct connection.
7 And you had mentioned the span of four to eight weeks
8 to consider it.

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Do you recall that?

11 A. I do, sir.

12 Q. You were not committing to any particular
13 timeframe for processing a request for direct
14 connection, were you?

15 A. No. I was just complying that in a normal
16 situation, it very possibly could be four to eight
17 weeks. It may be shorter; it may be longer.

18 MR. HIRD: I have nothing further. Thank
19 you.

20 THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.

21 JUDGE ALBERS: Any recross, Mr. Ortlieb?

22 MR. ORTLIEB: Nothing further, your Honor.
23 Thank you.

24 JUDGE ALBERS: Thank you.

1 Is there any objection then to NG-911
2 Exhibits 1, 1.1, or 2?
3 MR. ORTLIEB: No objection from AT&T.
4 JUDGE ALBERS: Hearing no objection, then
5 all three are admitted.
6 (NG-911, Inc. Exhibits 1.0, 1.1,
7 and 2.0 were admitted into evidence
8 at this time.)
9 MR. HIRD: Thank you, your Honor.
10 Your Honor, may Mr. Ramsey be excused at
11 this time?
12 JUDGE ALBERS: Yes, if he would like to.
13 MR. HIRD: Thank you, your Honor. Thank
14 you, Mr. Ramsey.
15 THE WITNESS: Thank you all. Appreciate
16 your time.
17 JUDGE ALBERS: Thank you.
18 And our next witness. Is there a preference
19 whether we hear from Mr. Galt or Mr. Felty first?
20 MR. CLEMONS: Judge, I would go with -- this
21 is John Clemons. I would like to call Tracy Felty
22 first.
23 JUDGE ALBERS: Go ahead.
24 * * * * *

1 TRACY FELTY,
2 of lawful age, produced, sworn and examined on behalf
3 of the PETITIONER, testifies and says:

4 DIRECT EXAMINATION

5 QUESTIONS BY MR. CLEMONS:

6 Q. Would you state your name, sir?

7 A. Tracy L. Felty, F-E-L-T-Y.

8 Q. And Mr. Felty, what is your occupation or
9 employment?

10 A. I am employed by the County of Saline as the
11 911 director.

12 Q. What is your business address with that
13 organization?

14 A. One North Main Street, Harrisburg, Illinois,
15 62946.

16 Q. Mr. Felty, I'd like to direct your attention
17 to June 27, 2014. On that date, did you cause to be
18 filed with the Illinois Commerce Commission,
19 electronically, at their Springfield offices, a
20 document titled Pre-filed Testimony of Lieutenant
21 Tracy L. Felty, ENP, which also contained with it a
22 verification by you?

23 A. Yes, sir, I did.

24 Q. And let me again direct your attention to

1 another date, August 15, 2014. On that day, did you
2 cause me, as your attorney, to file with the Illinois
3 Commerce Commission, again electronically, to the ICC
4 office in Springfield, Illinois a document labeled
5 Pre-filed Rebuttal Testimony of Lieutenant Tracy L.
6 Felty? And that also had a verification and included
7 two intergovernmental agreements for 911 backup
8 services, which I believe were attached as Exhibits A
9 and Exhibit B.

10 Did you cause that to be filed?

11 A. Yes, sir, I did.

12 MR. CLEMONS: And your Honor, I would ask
13 that these two items be marked as Petitioner
14 Exhibit 1.0 for the June 27th exhibit and Petitioners
15 Exhibit 2.0 for the August 15th exhibit.

16 JUDGE ALBERS: Since we have two petitioners
17 in these consolidated dockets, I think we'll call
18 them Saline Exhibit 1.0 and Saline Exhibit 2.0.

19 MR. CLEMONS: That would be good. Yes.

20 Thank you, Judge. Saline 1.0 and Saline 2.0.

21 Q. (By Mr. Clemons) Mr. Felty, if I were to
22 ask you today, as you sit here under oath at this
23 hearing, regarding those documents, Petitioner's
24 Exhibit Saline 1.0 and Petitioner's Exhibit Saline

1 2.0, would your testimony be the same as contained in
2 the pre-filed testimony and the pre-filed rebuttal
3 testimony 1.0 and 2.0?

4 A. Yes, sir.

5 Q. And is that testimony in those documents
6 true, correct, and accurate?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And do you have any additions to the
9 pre-filed testimony in those exhibits?

10 A. Not at this time.

11 Q. Any corrections or changes?

12 A. None that I am aware of.

13 Q. And finally, Mr. Felty, you're familiar with
14 the entire Petition to Modify 911 System Provider
15 filed in this case in this docket on June 4, 2014?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And you prepared the attachments to that
18 petition, did you not?

19 A. Yes, sir.

20 Q. And those were the plan narrative Exhibits 1
21 through 11, and you had an appendix numbered 1
22 through 5, correct?

23 A. That's correct.

24 Q. And are you asking that the Commission

1 consider all of those attachments, exhibits, plan
2 narratives, and the items contained in the appendix?

3 A. Yes, sir.

4 MR. CLEMONS: Your Honor, I have no further
5 direct testimony for this witness.

6 JUDGE ALBERS: All right.

7 MR. CLEMONS: I am asking that those
8 exhibits, as we identified, be admitted.

9 JUDGE ALBERS: Okay. We'll rule on the
10 admissibility following the cross examination. And I
11 think Mr. Ortlieb is the only one with any questions
12 for Mr. Felty.

13 Is your witness tendered for cross?

14 MR. CLEMONS: Yes.

15 MR. ORTLIEB: Thank you.

16 CROSS EXAMINATION

17 QUESTIONS BY MR. ORTLIEB:

18 Q. Lieutenant Felty, my name is Mark Ortlieb.
19 I'm an attorney for AT&T. I have a few questions for
20 you this morning.

21 Can you hear me okay?

22 A. Yes, sir.

23 Q. Thank you.

24 On page 10 of the plan narrative, Section

1 2.2, do you have that in front of you?

2 A. I am getting it, sir.

3 MR. CLEMONS: If you would give us a moment,
4 your Honor, we're looking through it.

5 MR. FELTY: Okay.

6 Q. (By Mr. Ortlieb) This is just to give you a
7 frame of reference. About two-thirds of the way
8 down, at the end of the Clearwave section, the
9 document states that access carriers have the option
10 to complete 911 calls by a FAS Clearwave or direct
11 connect.

12 Do you see that language?

13 A. Yes, I see that.

14 Q. And that third option, can you explain what
15 you have in mind when you say direct connect?

16 A. Well, I would have to defer that to the
17 NG-911, Inc. on networking questions.

18 Q. Is it your understanding that what that
19 refers to are direct connections to the NG-911 data
20 centers?

21 A. I believe so, yes.

22 MR. HIRD: Your Honor, I am going to object
23 to this line of questioning on the narrative to the
24 extent that it was adopted by Mr. Ramsey as part of

1 his testimony with the exception, I believe, of 2.14.
2 But the remainder of the narrative was actually
3 adopted and sponsored by Mr. Ramsey, not Mr. Felty.

4 MR. ORTLIEB: Your Honor, that is a very odd
5 objection. Because I am looking at Mr. Felty's
6 testimony on page two. He says that the purpose of
7 his testimony is to declare that the narrative and
8 its contents are true and to stand for testimony
9 regarding such.

10 So I am not wandering away from his
11 testimony.

12 JUDGE ALBERS: All right. I'll allow the
13 question. And Lieutenant Felty can answer to the
14 extent that he knows the answer.

15 MR. FELTY: You are going to have to repeat
16 the question, sir.

17 Q. (By Mr. Ortlieb) Is it your understanding
18 that the direct connection referred to on page 10 are
19 direct connections to the NG-911 data centers in
20 Harrisburg and Murphysboro?

21 A. That is my understanding, yes.

22 Q. And an access carrier -- AT&T Mobility would
23 be an access carrier, would it not?

24 A. T Mobility?

1 Q. AT&T Mobility would be one of the access
2 carriers that is referred to in that sentence we were
3 discussing?

4 A. It's a possibility, yes.

5 Q. Do you know, Lieutenant Felty, what AT&T
6 would have to do to make these direct connections
7 happen?

8 A. Again, I would defer to my SSB provider,
9 NG-911, Inc., about connectivity issues.

10 Q. You don't have any technical perspective or
11 technical background on direct connections?

12 A. No, sir.

13 Q. Would -- since it's listed -- since direct
14 connection is listed as an option in Saline County's
15 plan narrative, is it fair to say that Saline County
16 supports direct connections as an option for access
17 carriers?

18 A. Yes. We have been supportive of direct
19 connections.

20 Q. So that if AT&T Mobility wanted to pursue
21 direct connections, would Saline County cooperate
22 with that request to make it happen?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Lieutenant, let me switch just real briefly

1 to your rebuttal testimony. And on line 31 and 32,
2 there's some discussion of a Johnson County filing.

3 Do you see that portion of your testimony?

4 A. Yes, sir.

5 Q. Did Johnson County, in fact, file a plan on
6 August 18th?

7 A. That, I am not aware of.

8 Q. Do you know whether or not that filing has
9 been delayed?

10 A. That, I am not aware of. It's not my
11 county.

12 Q. And then the final line of questioning I
13 have for you relates to page 28 of your plan
14 narrative. And this refers, once again, to those
15 five new conditions that have been added.

16 A. Yes, sir.

17 Q. Am I correct that by including those
18 conditions in the plan narratives, Saline County is
19 supporting and agreeing to cooperate in getting those
20 five things done?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And does Saline County have any objection to
23 the participation of AT&T Mobility or AT&T Illinois
24 in weekly implementation conference calls should they

1 make that request?

2 A. I see none.

3 MR. ORTLIEB: All right. Thank you very
4 much, Lieutenant. I have no further questions.

5 MR. CLEMONS: Judge, John Clemons again.
6 I would now offer what we have marked as
7 Saline County Petitioner's Exhibit 1.0 and 2.0.

8 JUDGE ALBERS: All right. And you have no
9 redirect?

10 MR. CLEMONS: I have no redirect. That's
11 why I am making the offer.

12 JUDGE ALBERS: Any objection then to these
13 exhibits?

14 MR. ORTLIEB: No objection from AT&T.

15 JUDGE ALBERS: Saline Exhibits 1.0 and 2.0,
16 Attachments A and B are admitted.
17 (Saline Exhibits 1.0 and 2.0,
18 Attachments A and B were admitted
19 into evidence at this time.)

20 JUDGE ALBERS: All right. Thank you,
21 Lieutenant.
22 Mr. Clemons.

23 MR. CLEMONS: Judge, John Clemons again.
24 I would like to go forward with calling

1 Steven J. Galt.

2 JUDGE ALBERS: Please do.

3 MR. CLEMONS: Thank you.

4 * * * * *

5 STEVE GALT,

6 of lawful age, produced, sworn and examined on behalf

7 of the PETITIONERS, testifies and says:

8 DIRECT EXAMINATION

9 QUESTIONS BY MR. CLEMONS:

10 Q. Sir, would you state your name?

11 A. Steve J. Galt, G-A-L-T.

12 Q. And Mr. Galt, what is your occupation or

13 employer?

14 A. Gallatin County Emergency Telephone Systems

15 Board.

16 Q. And what is your business address?

17 A. 9200 Duncan Lane, Shawneetown, Illinois,

18 62984.

19 Q. Mr. Galt, I'd like to direct your attention

20 to June 27, 2014. On that date, did you cause to be

21 filed with the Illinois Commerce Commission,

22 electronically, a document that was titled Pre-filed

23 Testimony of Steve J. Galt?

24 A. Yes, sir.

1 Q. And did you also direct on August 15, 2014,
2 to be filed with the Illinois Commerce Commission,
3 electronically, to their Springfield office, a second
4 document which was titled Pre-filed Rebuttal
5 Testimony of Steven J. Galt?

6 A. Yes, I did.

7 Q. And your Honor, if I can mark those two
8 documents. At this time, we would call them Gallatin
9 County 1.0 and Gallatin County 2.0.

10 JUDGE ALBERS: All right.

11 Q. (By Mr. Clemons) Mr. Galt, if I were to ask
12 you about these two documents, these two exhibits,
13 Gallatin 1.0 and Gallatin 2.0, as you sit here today
14 under oath regarding those documents, would your
15 testimony be the same as contained in these pre-filed
16 testimony documents?

17 A. Yes, sir.

18 Q. And is that testimony contained in those
19 documents, now Exhibits 1.0 and 2.0, true, correct,
20 and accurate?

21 A. Yes, sir.

22 Q. And do you have any additions to the
23 pre-filed testimony in those documents, Exhibits 1.0,
24 2.0?

1 A. No, sir.

2 Q. Any corrections to them?

3 A. No, sir.

4 Q. And Mr. Galt, you're familiar with your
5 Petition to Modify 911 System Provider also filed in
6 this consolidated docket on June 4, 2014?

7 A. Yes, sir.

8 Q. And that filing contained a plan narrative,
9 various attachments, various exhibits. I believe,
10 your exhibits were 1 through 11 following the plan
11 narrative, and I believe you had an appendix marked 1
12 through 6, correct?

13 A. Yes, that's correct.

14 Q. And are you asking in your testimony here
15 today that those be considered along with your
16 petition?

17 A. Yes, sir.

18 MR. CLEMONS: No further questions of Mr.
19 Galt, your Honor.

20 JUDGE ALBERS: All right. We'll rule on the
21 admissibility following cross examination.

22 And again, Mr. Ortlieb, I think you're the
23 only party with questions, so please proceed.

24 MR. ORTLIEB: Thank you, your Honor, Mr.

1 Galt.

2 CROSS EXAMINATION

3 QUESTIONS BY MR. ORTLIEB:

4 Q. Good morning. My name is Mark Ortlieb
5 representing AT&T.

6 Can you hear me okay?

7 A. Yes, sir.

8 Q. Thank you.

9 Let's, as we did with Lieutenant Felty,
10 let's start with the plan narrative. If you have
11 that in front of you, could you turn to page 11,
12 please?

13 A. Okay.

14 Q. And Gallatin County makes the same
15 representation concerning direct connection, does it
16 not? Do you see the words about one-third of the way
17 down the page?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Where it says that Gallatin County is now
20 saying that access carriers have the option to direct
21 connect, is that correct?

22 A. Right.

23 Q. So that is it your understanding that this
24 means that AT&T Mobility, for example, could

1 establish direct connections to the two NG-911 data
2 centers, the one in Murphysboro and the other one in
3 Harrisburg?

4 A. Yes, sir.

5 Q. Do you know what would have to be done from
6 a technical perspective in order to make that happen?

7 A. No, sir, I do not.

8 Q. If AT&T Mobility were to make such a
9 request, would Gallatin County support that request?

10 A. Yes, sir.

11 Q. And would Gallatin County cooperate to make
12 that happen?

13 A. Yes, sir.

14 Q. On page 28 of the plan narrative, once
15 again, we're talking about the five new commitments
16 to assist in implementation.

17 Do you see where you have put those in the
18 plan narrative?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. And will AT&T Mobility, if it desires to
21 attend the weekly implementation conference calls for
22 Gallatin county, would AT&T Mobility be able to do
23 that?

24 A. Yes, I assume so.

1 Q. And would AT&T Mobility be able to receive
2 whatever information is made available to other
3 carriers in the course of those implementation
4 efforts?

5 A. Yes, I assume so.

6 MR. ORTLIEB: Thank you very much, Mr. Galt.
7 I have no further questions.

8 JUDGE ALBERS: Any redirect?

9 MR. CLEMONS: No redirect of Mr. Galt by the
10 Petitioner, your Honor.

11 JUDGE ALBERS: Any objection to the
12 admission of Gallatin Exhibits 1.0 or 2.0?

13 MR. ORTLIEB: No objection from AT&T.

14 MR. HIRD: No objection from NG-911, Inc.

15 JUDGE ALBERS: Hearing no objection, then
16 Gallatin Exhibit 1.0, 2.0, and Attachment A to 2.0
17 are admitted.

18 (Gallatin Exhibit 1.0, 2.0,
19 Attachment A to 2.0 were admitted
20 into evidence at this time.)

21 JUDGE ALBERS: All right. I think the only
22 party left then with a witness, or witnesses, is
23 Staff. So Mr. Harvey.

24 MR. HARVEY: Yes, your Honor. Staff first

1 calls Stacy Ross.

2 JUDGE ALBERS: She is here.

3 MR. HARVEY: Wonderful.

4 * * * * *

5 STACY ROSS,

6 of lawful age, produced, sworn and examined on behalf

7 of STAFF, testifies and says:

8 DIRECT EXAMINATION

9 QUESTIONS BY MR. HARVEY:

10 Q. Ms. Ross, would you state your name, please,

11 and spell it for the record?

12 A. Stacy, S-T-A-C-Y, Ross, R-O-S-S.

13 Q. Would you give your employment and the

14 nature of it?

15 A. Could you repeat that?

16 Q. I am sorry.

17 Are you employed; and if so, how?

18 A. I am a 911 program analyst with the Illinois

19 Commerce Commission in the Safety and Reliability

20 Division.

21 Q. Thank you.

22 Now, do you have in front of you a document

23 that has been marked as Staff Exhibit 1.0 in this

24 proceeding?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And referring to that document, does it
3 consist of a cover page and 10 pages of text in
4 question and answer format?

5 A. Yes, it does.

6 Q. And is that your direct testimony in this
7 proceeding?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And was it prepared by you or at your
10 direction?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. If I were to ask you the questions that are
13 set forth in that Exhibit 1.0 today, would your
14 answers be the same as they were when it was filed on
15 e-Docket?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Are each of those answers true and correct?

18 A. Yes.

19 MR. HARVEY: Your Honor, with that, I will
20 request admission -- or move for admission of Staff
21 Exhibit 1.0 into evidence and tender Ms. Ross for
22 cross examination.

23 JUDGE ALBERS: All right. We'll rule on the
24 admissibility following any questions.

1 Mr. Ortlieb, did you have questions for
2 Mr. Ross?

3 MR. ORTLIEB: Just very few, your Honor.
4 Thank you.

5 CROSS EXAMINATION

6 QUESTIONS BY MR. ORTLIEB:

7 Q. Ms. Ross, this is Mark Ortlieb and I
8 represent AT&T in this proceeding.

9 Can you hear me?

10 A. Yes, I can.

11 Q. Thank you very much.

12 I have just a very few questions for you.
13 And I'd like to start by directing you to line 141 of
14 your testimony.

15 A. Okay.

16 Q. And in this portion of your testimony, you
17 state that direct connection to the 911 system
18 providers data centers is an option made available in
19 both of the plan narratives we have been talking
20 about today, is that correct?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q. Are you aware of anything in the plan
23 narrative or in the testimony that describes in any
24 detail how such a direct connection would take place?

1 A. No.

2 Q. So is it your understanding that that is
3 something that would have to be developed?

4 A. I would assume.

5 Q. Does Staff have any objection to the option
6 of direct connection that is being offered by parties
7 to this proceeding?

8 A. No.

9 Q. And in future filings that may be made by
10 other counties, do you see any reason why plan
11 narratives could not provide a bit of additional
12 detail on how a direct connection would take place?

13 A. That would be up to the petitioners making
14 the filing.

15 Q. I want to switch your attention just briefly
16 to on page nine. There is a sentence that begins on
17 line 183, that says: Additionally, it is my opinion
18 that it will be extremely important for Commission
19 Staff to monitor the progress of new NG-911 systems
20 in Illinois to ensure a smooth transmission back and
21 forth between Legacy and NG-911 networks.

22 Could you explain in a little more detail
23 what you have in mind by the transition back and
24 forth?

1 A. I think that just has to do with when we're
2 listening in on implementation calls, we want to make
3 sure that there's smooth communication back and forth
4 between the two, and between the different parties
5 during the transition period.

6 Q. Thank you.

7 And in terms of implementation, further down
8 the page, there appear, again, the five additional
9 conditions that Staff has recommended.

10 Do you see those?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. On page nine.

13 And does Staff have any objection if AT&T
14 Mobility, for example, were to participate in the
15 weekly implementation conference calls with respect
16 to Saline and Gallatin Counties?

17 A. No, we wouldn't object to that.

18 Q. And the reports that are referred to in Item
19 1 and the schedule referred to in Item 3, and the
20 traffic studies in Item 4, and trouble reporting in
21 Item 5, are those reports or is that information that
22 would be shared with the participants in the weekly
23 conference calls, such as AT&T Mobility?

24 A. It would be.

1 MR. ORTLIEB: Thank you very much, Ms. Ross,
2 I have no further questions.

3 JUDGE ALBERS: I just have one question for
4 you.

5 EXAMINATION

6 QUESTIONS BY JUDGE ALBERS:

7 Q. Does the rebuttal testimony from the
8 Petitioners and NG-911 resolve the concerns you raise
9 in your testimony?

10 A. Yes, it does.

11 JUDGE ALBERS: All right. Thank you.

12 Mr. Harvey, do you have any redirect?

13 MR. HARVEY: None, your Honor.

14 We would move for the admission of Staff
15 Exhibit 1.0 into evidence.

16 JUDGE ALBERS: Any objection?

17 MR. ORTLIEB: No objection from AT&T.

18 MR. CLEMONS: No objection from Petitioner.

19 MR. HIRD: No objection from NG-911, Inc.

20 JUDGE ALBERS: Hearing no objection, Staff
21 Exhibit 1 is admitted.

22 (Staff Exhibit 1 was admitted into
23 evidence at this time.)

24 JUDGE ALBERS: We had Mr. Murray's

1 testimony. And I received an affidavit for that
2 earlier today.

3 MR. HIRD: Your Honor, this is Rick Hird. I
4 need to step away from the phone for just a moment
5 while Mr. Harvey is introducing Mr. Murray's
6 testimony.

7 JUDGE ALBERS: All right.

8 MR. HIRD: Is that okay?

9 JUDGE ALBERS: Sure.

10 MR. HIRD: I will be right back.

11 MR. HARVEY: Thank you, your Honor.

12 While I understand Mr. Murray is present in
13 open court today, there was some concern that he
14 might be unable to be yesterday. Nobody had any
15 questions for him. I took the liberty of filing an
16 affidavit in support of his direct testimony.

17 His direct testimony was filed on August 1.
18 It consists of six pages of text in question and
19 answer format. It is supported by an affidavit,
20 Staff Exhibit 3.0, swearing to the truth and accuracy
21 of the matters set forth in Staff Exhibit 2.0, that
22 being his direct testimony.

23 And I would move for the admission of both
24 of those items into evidence at this time.

1 JUDGE ALBERS: Okay. Any objection?

2 MR. ORTLIEB: None from AT&T.

3 MR. CLEMONS: No objection from Petitioner.

4 JUDGE ALBERS: All right. Then Staff

5 Exhibits 2 and 3 are admitted.

6 (Staff Exhibits 2.0 and 3.0 were

7 admitted into evidence at this

8 time.)

9 JUDGE ALBERS: I think that takes care of

10 all of our witnesses.

11 Turning then to the rest of the schedule in

12 this case, does anyone feel inclined to file any kind

13 of brief?

14 MR. CLEMONS: Your Honor, this is John

15 Clemons for Petitioner. We don't believe there are

16 any significant disputes given the testimony today

17 and the sum total of the pre-filed testimonies we

18 have all reviewed prior to today that would

19 necessitate any briefing.

20 JUDGE ALBERS: All right.

21 Well, Mr. Ortlieb, do you concur?

22 MR. ORTLIEB: I had not anticipated that

23 question, your Honor. But if nobody else is filing a

24 brief, I think AT&T will also take a pass.

1 JUDGE ALBERS: All right.

2 MR. HIRD: NG-911, Inc. will not be filing a
3 brief.

4 JUDGE ALBERS: All right.

5 MR. HARVEY: If I can ask my clients in
6 Springfield if they're comfortable with that
7 approach.

8 MS. ROSS: Yeah, we're okay with it.

9 JUDGE ALBERS: Yes. They're all shaking
10 their head yes. That's fine.

11 My other question then, does anyone have any
12 objection then to -- well, does anyone have any
13 objection to the requested relief?

14 And Mr Ortlieb, I'm looking to you.

15 MR. ORTLIEB: I would not state an objection
16 on the record. We have a position of neutrality.

17 JUDGE ALBERS: Okay.

18 Does anyone object to five years of
19 confidential treatment for Exhibit 7 and 11 attached
20 to each petition?

21 (No response.)

22 JUDGE ALBERS: I'll take the silence as no.

23 So I don't imagine I will see any need for a
24 Proposed Order then.

1 And I am sorry, one other final housekeeping
2 question. Were there any other exhibits for which
3 confidential treatment was being sought?

4 MR. CLEMONS: This is Petitioner -- for
5 Petitioner, John Clemons. I don't believe so, your
6 Honor, other than 7 and 11 exhibits.

7 JUDGE ALBERS: Yeah, those are the only ones
8 I was aware of. I just wanted to check. All right.
9 Thank you.

10 All right. I don't have anything else.
11 Anyone have any other questions or comments before we
12 conclude?

13 MR. ORTLIEB: Nothing from AT&T.

14 MR. CLEMONS: Your Honor, John Clemons.
15 Would the Court then be preparing an Order on this --

16 JUDGE ALBERS: Yes.

17 MR. CLEMONS: -- at some point?

18 We're just trying to get an idea for our
19 cutover situation.

20 JUDGE ALBERS: I have some time here in the
21 next few days. I will probably work on it then and
22 try to get it on -- since there's no more Commission
23 sessions in August, and it's too late to get anything
24 on the September 3rd meeting, and the next meeting is

1 September 18th. So I can try to shoot for that.

2 MR. CLEMONS: That would be wonderful, your
3 Honor. Thank you.

4 JUDGE ALBERS: All right.

5 All right. If there's nothing further then,
6 thank you all. And we'll mark the record heard and
7 taken.

8 HEARD AND TAKEN.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Angela C. Turner, a Certified Shorthand
Reporter within and for the State of Illinois, do
hereby certify that the hearing aforementioned was
held on the time and in the place previously
described.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
hand and seal.

Angela C. Turner
IL CSR #084-004122